arXiv:math/0610360v1 [math.NT] 11 Oct 2006

The maximal order of a class of multiplicative arithmetical functions

László Tóth [*] *(Pécs) and Eduard Wirsing (Ulm)*

Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest., Sect. Comp.,
22 *(2003), 353-364*

Abstract. We prove simple theorems concerning the maximal order of a large class of multiplicative functions. As an application, we determine the maximal orders of certain functions of the type $\sigma_A(n) = \sum_{d\in A(n)} d$, where $A(n)$ is a subset of the set of all positive divisors of n, including the divisor-sum function $\sigma(n)$ and its unitary and exponential analogues. We also give the minimal order of a new class of Euler-type functions, including the Euler-function $\phi(n)$ and its unitary analogue.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 11A25, 11N37

Key Words and Phrases: maximal order, minimal order, divisor-sum function, Euler's function, unitary divisor, exponential divisor, generalized convolution

1. Introduction

Let $\sigma(n)$ and $\phi(n)$ denote, as usual, the sum of all positive divisors of n and the Euler function, respectively. It is well-known, that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sigma(n)}{n\log\log n} \;=\; e^{\gamma}\,, \tag{1}$$

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\phi(n)\log\log n}{n} \;=\; e^{-\gamma}\,, \tag{2}$$

[*]Supported partially by the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research under grant OTKA T031877

where γ is Euler's constant. These results go back to the work of T.H. Gronwall [5] and E. Landau [7] and have been established for a number of modified σ- and ϕ- functions.

One such modification relates to unitary divisors d of n, notation $d \parallel n$, meaning that $d|n$ and $(d, n/d) = 1$. The corresponding σ- and ϕ-functions are defined by $\sigma^*(n) = \sum_{d \parallel n} d$ and $\phi^*(n) = \#\{1 \le k \le n\,; (k,n)_* = 1\}$, where $(k,n)_*$ denotes the largest divisor of k which is a unitary divisor of n. These functions are multiplicative and for prime powers p^ν given by $\sigma^*(p^\nu) = p^\nu + 1$, $\phi^*(p^\nu) = p^\nu - 1$, see [3, 8]. They are treated, along with other multiplicative functions, in [2] with the result that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sigma^*(n)}{n \log\log n} \;=\; \frac{6}{\pi^2} e^\gamma \,, \tag{3}$$

while ϕ^* gives again (2). (Actually (3) is written incorrectly in [2] with the factor $6/\pi^2$ missing).

In [4] it is shown that (3) holds also for $\sigma^{(e)}(n)$, the sum of exponential divisors of n. (A number $d = \prod p^{\delta_p}$ is called an exponential divisor of $n = \prod p^{\nu_p}$ if $\delta_p | \nu_p$ for all p.)

These and a number of similar results from literature refer to rather special functions. Textbooks dealing with the extremal order of arithmetic functions also treat only particular cases, see [6, 1, 11]. It should be mentioned that a useful result concerning the maximal order of a class of prime-independent functions, including the number of all divisors, unitary divisors and exponential divisors, is proved in [10].

In the present paper we develop easily applicable theorems for determining

$$L \;=\; L(f) \;:=\; \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(n)}{\log\log n}$$

where f are nonnegative real-valued multiplicative functions. Essential parameters are

$$\rho(p) \;=\; \rho(f,p) \;:=\; \sup_{\nu\ge 0} f(p^\nu)\,,$$

for the primes p, and the product

$$R \;=\; R(f) \;:=\; \prod_p \Big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\Big)\rho(p)\,.$$

These theorems can, in particular, be used to obtain the maximal or minimal order, respectively, of generalized σ- and ϕ-functions which arise in connection with Narkiewicz-convolutions of arithmetic functions.

2. General results

We formulate the conditions for lower and upper estimates for L separately. Note that $\rho(p) \geq f(p^0) = 1$ for all p.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that $\rho(p) < \infty$ for all primes p and that the product R converges unconditionally (i.e. irrespectively of order), improper limits being allowed, then*

$$L \;\leq\; e^\gamma R\,. \tag{4}$$

A different assumption uses

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $\rho(p) < \infty$ for all p and that the product R converges, improper limits being allowed, and that*

$$\rho(p) \;\leq\; 1 + o\Big(\frac{\log p}{p}\Big)\,. \tag{5}$$

then (4) holds.

Remark. Neither does (5) plus convergence imply unconditional convergence nor vice versa.

To establish $e^\gamma R$ also as the lower limit more information is required: The suprema $\rho(p)$ must be sufficiently well approximated by not too large powers of p.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that $\rho(p) < \infty$ for all primes p, that for each prime p there is an exponent $e_p = p^{o(1)} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\prod_p f(p^{e_p})\rho(p)^{-1} \;>\; 0\,, \tag{6}$$

and that the product R converges, improper limits being allowed. Then

$$L \;\geq\; e^\gamma R\,.$$

Corollary 1. *If for all p we have $\rho(p) \leq (1-1/p)^{-1}$ and there are e_p such that $f(p^{e_p}) \geq 1 + 1/p$ then*

$$L \;=\; e^\gamma R\,.$$

In other words: The maximal order of $f(n)$ is $e^\gamma R \log\log n$.

Formally R becomes infinite if there is a nonempty set $\mathcal{S}$ of primes for which $\rho(p) = \infty$. So one might expect that the assumptions of Theorem 3 taken for all p with finite $\rho(p)$ would imply $L = \infty$. Surprisingly enough this is true only for rather thin sets $\mathcal{S}$. But note that for $p \in \mathcal{S}$ there is no substitute for the $f(p^{e_p})$ approximating $\rho(p)$.

We begin by stating what the above theorems imply if one ignores the numbers with prime factors from a given set $\mathcal{S}$ of primes. For any such set define

$$N(\mathcal{S}) \;:=\; \{n\colon n \in \mathbb{N},\; p|n \Rightarrow p \in \mathcal{S}\}\,, \quad C(\mathcal{S}) \;:=\; \{n\colon n \in \mathbb{N},\; p|n \Rightarrow p \notin \mathcal{S}\}\,.$$

Corollary 2. *Modify the assumptions of Theorems 1, 2, and 3 by replacing R with*

$$R_{\mathcal{S}} \;=\; R_{\mathcal{S}}(f) \;:=\; \prod_{p \notin \mathcal{S}} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\Big)\rho(p)\,,$$

L with

$$L_{\mathcal{S}} \;=\; L_{\mathcal{S}}(f) \;:=\; \limsup_{n \to \infty,\, n \in C(\mathcal{S})} \frac{f(n)}{\log\log n}\,,$$

condition (5) *with*

$$\rho(p) \;\le\; 1 + o\Big(\frac{\log p}{p}\Big) \quad \textit{for} \quad p \notin \mathcal{S}\,. \tag{7}$$

and (6) *with*

$$\prod_{p \notin \mathcal{S}} f(p^{e_p})\rho(p)^{-1} \;>\; 0\,. \tag{8}$$

Assume further that

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{p} \;<\; \infty\,.$$

Then

$$L_{\mathcal{S}} \;\le\; e^{\gamma} \prod_{p \in \mathcal{S}} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\Big) \cdot R_{\mathcal{S}}\,, \quad L_{\mathcal{S}} \;\ge\; e^{\gamma} \prod_{p \in \mathcal{S}} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\Big) \cdot R_{\mathcal{S}}\,,$$

respectively. This applies even if $\rho(p) = \infty$ for some or all of the $p \in \mathcal{S}$.

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a set of primes such that*

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{p} \;<\; \infty\,. \tag{9}$$

If $\rho(p) = \infty$ exactly for the $p \in \mathcal{S}$, if (8) *holds and $R_{\mathcal{S}} > 0$, then $L = \infty$. Condition* (9) *must not be waived.*

In fact there are counter-examples for any set $\mathcal{S}$ for which $\sum 1/p$ diverges.

3. The proofs

Proof of Theorem 1. An arbitrary $n = \prod p^{\nu_p}$ we write as $n = n_1 n_2$ with $n_1 := \prod_{p \le \log n} p^{\nu_p}$. Mertens's formula $\prod_{p \le x}(1-1/p)^{-1} \sim e^\gamma \log x$ and the definition of $\rho(p)$ imply

$$\begin{aligned} f(n_1) \;&=\; \prod_{p \le \log n} f(p^{\nu_p}) \;\le\; \prod_{p \le \log n} \rho(p) \\ &=\; \prod_{p \le \log n} \Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)^{-1} \cdot \prod_{p \le \log n} \Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\rho(p)\,, \\ f(n_1) \;&\le\; \big(1+o(1)\big) e^\gamma R \log\log n \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty\,. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Let a denote the number of prime divisors in n_2. Then $a \le \log n / \log\log n$. There is nothing to prove if $R = \infty$, so let $R < \infty$. Using the unconditional convergence

$$\begin{aligned} f(n_2) \;&\le\; \prod_{p \mid n,\, p > \log n} \Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\rho(p) \cdot \prod_{p \mid n,\, p > \log n} \Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)^{-1} \\ &\le\; \big(1+o(1)\big) \cdot \Big(1-\frac{1}{\log n}\Big)^{-a} \\ &=\; \big(1+o(1)\big)\, e^{O(1/\log\log n)} \;\to\; 1\,. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Combining (10) and (11) finishes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 2. There is no change in the estimation of $f(n_1)$. For n_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(n_2) \;&\le\; \Big(1+o\big(\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}\big)\Big)^{\frac{\log n}{\log\log n}} \\ &=\; 1+o(1)\,. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3. We treat the case of proper convergence only. There is nothing to prove if $R = 0$ and the changes for $R = \infty$ are obvious. For given ε take P so large that

$$\prod_{p > P} f(p^{e_p})\rho(p)^{-1} \;\ge\; 1-\varepsilon \tag{12}$$

and choose exponents k_p for the $p \le P$ such that

$$\prod_{p \le P} f(p^{k_p}) \;\ge\; (1-\varepsilon) \prod_{p \le P} \rho(p)\,. \tag{13}$$

Keeping P and the k_p fixed let x tend to infinity and consider

$$n(x) \;:=\; \prod_{p\le P} p^{k_p} \prod_{P<p\le x} p^{e_p}\,.$$

Now on the one hand, using (12) and (13) we see

$$\begin{aligned} f\big(n(x)\big)\prod_{p\le x}\Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big) \;&\ge\; (1-\varepsilon)\prod_{p\le x}\Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\rho(p)\cdot\prod_{P<p\le x} f(p^{e_p})\rho(p)^{-1} \\ &\ge\; (1-\varepsilon)^2\big(1+o(1)\big)R \end{aligned}$$

and with Mertens's formula again

$$f\big(n(x)\big) \;\ge\; (1-\varepsilon)^2\big(1+o(1)\big)R\,e^{\gamma}\log x\,. \tag{14}$$

On the other hand, since $e_p = p^{o(1)}$, we have

$$\log n(x) \;\le\; \sum_{p\le P} k_p\log p \;+\; \sum_{P<p\le x} e_p\log p \;\le\; x^{o(1)}\sum_{p\le x}\log p \;=\; x^{1+o(1)}\,,$$

and therefore

$$\log\log n(x) \;\le\; \big(1+o(1)\big)\log x\,.$$

Together with (14) this yields the lower bound

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty}\frac{f\big(n(x)\big)}{\log\log n(x)} \;\ge\; (1-\varepsilon)^2 R\,e^{\gamma}$$

with arbitrary $\varepsilon>0$. □

Proof of Corollary 1. Apply Theorems 1 (or 2) and 3. □

Proof of Corollary 2. To see this one applies the theorems to the multiplicative function f^* defined by $f^*(n)=f(n)$ for $n\in C(\mathcal{S})$ and $f(n)=1$ for $n\in N(\mathcal{S})$. One finds

$$L(f^*)=L_{\mathcal{S}}(f)\,,\quad R(f^*)=R_{\mathcal{S}}(f)\prod_{p\in\mathcal{S}}\Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\,,$$

and (8) implies (6) for f^* because $\prod_{p\in\mathcal{S}}(1-1/p)$ converges absolutely.

Note also that for any sequence of numbers $n=n_1n_2$ tending to ∞, where $n_1\in N(\mathcal{S})$, $n_2\in C(\mathcal{S})$, we have $f^*(n)/\log\log n = f(n_2)/\log\log(n_1n_2)$, hence $\limsup f^*(n)/\log\log n = 0$ if n_2 stays bounded, and $\le \limsup_{n_2} f(n_2)/\log\log n_2$ otherwise, with equality if n_1 is bounded. Thus $L(f^*)=L_{\mathcal{S}}$. □

Proof of Theorem 4. **I.** Assume (9). With any $n_1\in N(\mathcal{S})$ we have

$$L \;\ge\; \limsup_{n_2\in C(\mathcal{S})}\frac{f(n_1)f(n_2)}{\log\log(n_1n_2)} \;=\; f(n_1)L_{\mathcal{S}}\,.$$

From Corollary 2, as it refers to Theorem 3, we have $L_{\mathcal{S}} > 0$ and $f(n_1)$ can be chosen arbitrarily big.

II. Assume that (9) does not hold. We shall construct a counter-example. The assumption implies that

$$g(x) \;:=\; \prod_{p\in\mathcal{S},\, p\le x} \Big(1+\frac{1}{p}\Big)$$

tends to ∞ as $x\to\infty$. Choose an increasing sequence of numbers $q_j = p_j^{\nu_j}$ with $p_j\in\mathcal{S}$ and ν_j so large that $g(\log q_j)\ge j^j$ for all j, and such that every prime $p\in\mathcal{S}$ occurs infinitely often in the sequence of the p_j. Put $f(q_j)=j$ for all $j\in\mathbb{N}$ and $f(p^\nu)=1+1/p$ for all p^ν that are not among the q_j. Then, obviously, $\rho(p)=\infty$ for $p\in\mathcal{S}$ and $\rho(p)=1+1/p$ for $p\notin\mathcal{S}$. The product

$$R_{\mathcal{S}} \;=\; \prod_{p\notin\mathcal{S}} \Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{1}{p}\Big)$$

converges absolutely and so does (choosing $e_p=1$) $\prod_{p\notin\mathcal{S}} f(p^1)/\rho(p)=1$. Any $n\in\mathbb{N}$ can be written as $n=n_1n_2$ where n_1 collects from the canonical representation of n those prime powers that occur among the q_j while the rest compose n_2. For given n let $k:=\max\{j;\, q_j\,\|\,n_1\}$. Then $f(n_1)\le k! = o(k^k) = o\big(g(\log q_k)\big) = o\big(g(\log n)\big)$ by construction. Now for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} f(n) \;=\; f(n_1)f(n_2) \;&=\; \prod_{p\mid n,\, p\notin\mathcal{S}} \Big(1+\frac{1}{p}\Big)\cdot o\big(g(\log n)\big) \\ &=\; o\Big(\prod_{p\le\log n}\Big(1+\frac{1}{p}\Big)\Big)\cdot \prod_{p\mid n,\, p\ge\log n}\Big(1+\frac{1}{p}\Big) \\ &\le\; o(\log\log n)\cdot\Big(1+\frac{1}{\log n}\Big)^{\frac{\log n}{\log\log n}} \;=\; o(\log\log n)\,, \end{aligned}$$

hence $L=0$. □

4. Applications

A general frame for generalizations of the σ- and ϕ-functions mentioned in the introduction can be found in Narkiewicz [9]. Assume that for each n a set $A(n)$ of divisors of n is given and consider the A-convolution $*_A$ defined by

$$\big(f*_A g\big)(n) \;:=\; \sum_{d\in A(n)} f(d)\, g\Big(\frac{n}{d}\Big)\,. \tag{15}$$

Properties of convolution (15) and of arithmetical functions related to it have been studied extensively in the literature, see [9, 8]. The system A is called multiplicative if $A(n_1n_2) = A(n_1)A(n_2)$ for coprime n_1, n_2, with elementwise multiplication of the sets, and not all $A(n)$ empty. Such a divisor system can be described by the sets $AE_p(\nu)$ of admissible exponents,

$$AE_p(\nu) \;:=\; \{\delta;\; p^\delta \in A(p^\nu)\}\,.$$

The A-convolution of any two multiplicative functions f and g is multiplicative if and only if A is multiplicative. In particular multiplicativity of A implies multiplicativity of the modified divisor function

$$\sigma_A(n) \;:=\; \sum_{d\in A(n)} d\,.$$

As a natural means to define an Euler-function attached to A we consider the relation

$$\sum_{d\in A(n)} \phi_A(d) \;=\; n\,, \quad n \ge 1. \tag{16}$$

This need not be solvable; there is, however, the following

Theorem 5. *If the divisor system A is multiplicative then* (16) *has a solution if and only if $n \in A(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case the solution ϕ_A is unique and is a multiplicative function with $1 \le \phi_A(n) \le n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Suppose a solution exists. Then by induction on ν the recursion

$$\sum_{\delta\in AE_p(\nu)} \phi_A(p^\delta) \;=\; p^\nu \tag{17}$$

implies that $1 \le \phi_A(p^\nu) \le p^\nu$ and (therefore) $\nu \in AE_p(\nu)$ for all $\nu\colon\; p^\nu \in A(p^\nu)$. It follows from the multiplicativity of A that $n \in A(n)$ for all n. If, on the other hand, $n \in A(n)$ for all n, then (17) can be solved recursively and the multiplicative function defined from the $\phi_A(p^\nu)$ solves (16). This is in fact the only solution since $\phi_A(n) = n - \sum_{d\in A(n)\setminus\{n\}} \phi_A(d)$. □

With suitable additional conditions on A we give the maximal and minimal orders of σ_A and ϕ_A, respectively. Extremal orders of such functions have not been investigated in the literature.

Obviously $\sigma_A(n) \le \sigma(n)$ and if for any ν we have $p^\nu, p^{\nu-1} \in A(p^\nu)$ then $\sigma_A(p^\nu) \ge p^\nu + p^{\nu-1}$. So Corollary 1 applies to $f(n) = \sigma_A(n)/n$ and gives

Theorem 6. *Let the system A of divisors be multiplicative and suppose that for each prime p there is an exponent e_p such that*

$$p^{e_p},\, p^{e_p-1} \in A(p^{e_p})$$

and $e_p = p^{o(1)}$. *Then*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sigma_A(n)}{n\log\log n} \;=\; e^\gamma \prod_p \Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big) \sup_{\nu\ge 0} \frac{\sigma_A(p^\nu)}{p^\nu}\,,$$

where the product converges.

Remarks. The quotients $\sigma(p^\nu)/p^\nu$ are of the form $\sum \varepsilon_i p^{-i}$, $\varepsilon_i \in \{0,1\}$, and the set of such numbers is compact. Therefore each $\sup_\nu \big(\sigma_A(p^\nu)p^{-\nu}\big)$ is itself of this form and we have for each prime p a finite or infinite sequence of exponents a_i such that $2 \le a_1 < a_2 < \dots$ and

$$\Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big) \sup_\nu \frac{\sigma_A(p^\nu)}{p^\nu} \;=\; 1 - \frac{1}{p^{a_1}} + \frac{1}{p^{a_2}} - \frac{1}{p^{a_3}} + \dots\,.$$

The formulae (1) and (3) are obvious consequences of Theorem 6. In the standard case e_p is arbitrary, we have $(1-1/p)\rho(p) = 1$ for all p, hence $R = 1$. With unitary and exponential divisors the only admissible choices are $e_p = 1$ and $e_p = 2$, respectively and $(1-1/p)\rho(p) = 1-1/p^2$, , hence $R = \zeta(2)^{-1} = 6/\pi^2$ in both cases.

We turn to ϕ_A, assuming again that A is multiplicative and, in view of Theorem 5, that always $\nu \in AE_p(\nu)$. In order to determine the minimal order of ϕ_A consider the function $f(n) := n/\phi_A(n)$.

For all p and $\nu \ge 1$ we have $\phi_A(p^\nu) \ge p^\nu - \phi_A(p^{\nu-1}) - \dots - \phi_A(1) \ge p^\nu - p^{\nu-1} - \dots - 1$, which gives

$$f(p^\nu) \;<\; \frac{p-1}{p-2}\,, \qquad \rho(p) \;\le\; \frac{p-1}{p-2}\,.$$

Note that $\rho(2)$ may equal ∞. If moreover $e-1 \in AE_p(e)$ for some $e = e_p \ge 1$ then, on the other hand, $\phi_A(p^e) \le p^e - \phi_A(p^{e-1}) \le p^e - p^{e-1} + p^{e-2} + \dots + 1$ if $e \ge 2$, and $\phi_A(p) \le p-1$ if $e = 1$. Therefore

$$f(p^e) \;\ge\; \frac{p(p-1)}{p^2-2p+2}\,,$$

$$f(p^e)\rho(p)^{-1} \;\ge\; \frac{p(p-2)}{p^2-2p+2} \;=\; 1 - \frac{2}{p^2-2p+2}\,,$$

which is positive and yields a convergent product for $p \ge 3$.

Note that for powers of 2 there is no non-trivial lower estimate for $\phi_A(n)/n$ whithout further conditions on A. This is shown by the following example. Let $\mathcal{N} = \{n_1, n_2, \dots\} \subset \mathbb{N}$, $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$, and put $AE_2(n) := \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ for $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $AE_2(n) := \{n\}$ for $n \notin \mathcal{N}$. Then the recursion gives $\phi_A(2^n) = 2^n$ for $n \notin \mathcal{N}$ but $\phi_A(2^{n_j}) = 2^{n_{j-1}}$ for the $n \in \mathcal{N}$, where $n_0 = 0$. Hence it is possible to have $\rho(2) = \sup_\nu 2^\nu/\phi_A(2^\nu) = 2^{\sup_j (n_j - n_{j-1})} = \infty$.

Thus applying Corollary 1 or Theorem 4 with $\mathcal{S} = \{2\}$ we obtain

Theorem 7. *Let A be multiplicative and $n \in A(n)$ for all n. Assume that for each prime $p > 2$ there is an exponent e_p such that $p^{e_p - 1} \in A(p^{e_p})$ and $e_p = p^{o(1)}$. Then*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\phi_A(n) \log\log n}{n} \;=\; e^{-\gamma} \prod_p \Big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\Big)^{-1} \inf_\nu \frac{\phi_A(p^\nu)}{p^\nu}\,.$$

The product converges for $p > 2$; the first factor may vanish.

For the standard Euler function $\phi(n)$ and for its unitary analogue $\phi^*(n)$ we regain (2).

For the system of exponential divisors one has $\phi_A(1) = 1$ because of multiplicativity. The recursion $\sum_{\kappa|\nu} \phi_A(p^\kappa) = p^\nu$ is solved by $\phi_A(p^\nu) = \sum_{\kappa|\nu} \mu(\nu/\kappa) p^\kappa$. Again the minimum of $\phi_A(p^\nu)/p^\nu$ is $1 - 1/p$, it is taken for $\nu = e_p = 2$ and once more (2) follows.

References

[1] T. M. Apostol, Introduction to Analytic Number Theory, Springer – Verlag, New York, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1976.

[2] J. Chidambaraswamy and R. Sitaramachandrarao, Maximum orders of arithmetical functions associated with higher order divisors, Bulletin Number Theory Related Topics, **9** (1985), 1-11.

[3] E. Cohen, Arithmetical functions associated with the unitary divisors of an integer, Math. Z. **74** (1960), 66-80.

[4] J. Fabrykowski and M. V. Subbarao, The maximal order and the average order of the multiplicative function $\sigma^{(e)}(n)$, Théorie des nombres (Québec, PQ, 1987), 201-206, de Gruyter (Berlin – New York, 1989).

[5] T. H. Gronwall, Some asymptotic expressions in the theory of numbers, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **14** (1913), 113- 122.

[6] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers, 4th edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1960.

[7] E. Landau, Handbuch der Lehre von der Verteilung der Primzahlen, Teubner, Leipzig – Berlin, 1909.

[8] P. J. McCarthy, Introduction to Arithmetical Functions, Springer – Verlag, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, Tokyo, 1986.

[9] W. Narkiewicz, On a class of arithmetical convolutions, Colloq. Math., **10** (1963), 81-94.

[10] D. Suryanarayana and R. Sita Rama Chandra Rao, On the true maximum order of a class of arithmetical functions, Math. J. Okayama Univ., **17** (1975), 95-101.

[11] G. Tenenbaum, Introduction to Analytic and Probabilistic Number Theory, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.

László Tóth
University of Pécs
Institute of Mathematics and Informatics
Ifjúság u. 6,
7624 Pécs, Hungary
ltoth@ttk.pte.hu

Eduard Wirsing
Universität Ulm
Helmholtzstraße 22,
D–89069 Ulm, Germany
Tel.: +49–731–50–23565
wirsing@mathematik.uni-ulm.de